

80480-0

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

2000 SEP 14 P 4: 30 Supreme Court No. ~~80584-9~~

BY RENEE L. CARPENTER

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
CLERK

BLAKELEY COMMONS CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION,

Respondent,

v.

BLAKELEY VILLAGE, LLC,

Appellant.

APPELLANT BLAKELEY VILLAGE, LLC'S OPPOSITION TO
RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT RECORD

5808
JOEL T. SALMI, WSBA #~~6808~~
DANIEL L. DVORKIN, WSBA #32776
SALMI GILLASPY, PLLC

STELLMAN KEEHNEL, WSBA #9309
KIT ROTH, WSBA #33059
DLA PIPER US LLP
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 7000
Seattle, Washington 98104
Telephone: (206) 839-4800
Fax: (206) 839-4801
Attorneys for Defendant-Petitioner
Blakeley Village, LLC

23

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

TO THE PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

FROM

THE PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1960

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

I. IDENTITY OF RESPONDING PARTY AND STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

Appellant Blakeley Village, LLC ("Blakeley Village"), by and through its undersigned attorneys of record, hereby submits this Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Supplement Record. Blakeley Village respectfully requests that the Court deny Respondent's motion.

Respondent Blakeley Commons Condominium Association (the "HOA") has had continued access to Blakeley Village's files, from which the "new" evidence comes, dating back to no later than November 10, 2006.¹ The "new" evidence consists of contracts signed between the HOA's members and Blakeley Village, and so the HOA has *always* had access to the pertinent agreements. In any event, the HOA failed to take advantage of its access to Blakeley Village's files until October 10, 2007.² It apparently did not review and analyze the files, or its own members' records, until very recently. With oral argument in this consolidated appeal now less than two weeks away, the HOA's motion is a belated attempt to supplement the record with "new" evidence that it could have obtained and reviewed almost two years ago.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In July 2006, Blakeley Village moved the trial court to stay all of the HOA's claims — both the Washington Condominium Act ("WCA") claims and the non-WCA claims — based on arbitration provisions in the

¹ Declaration of Daniel L. Dvorkin in Support of Appellant Blakeley Village, LLC's Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Supplement Record.

² *Id.*

THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY
JOHN H. COLEMAN
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I.
BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY
J. B. LEECH, 15 N. STATE ST.
1857.

CONTENTS.

PAGE
The First Settlement of the City of Boston, 1630
The Growth of the City, 1630-1680
The Revolutions of 1773-1780
The City of Boston in 1857

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

original purchase and sale agreements related to each condominium unit at the Blakeley Commons Condominium (the "project").³ On August 8, 2006, the trial court issued a stay of proceedings and postponed ruling on Blakeley Village's arbitration motion, pending the Court of Appeals' decision in Satomi Owners Association v. Satomi, LLC.⁴

After the Satomi decision was issued by the Court of Appeals, Blakeley Village renewed its motion to stay all of the Association's claims and compel arbitration, and the HOA moved to lift the stay.⁵ The motions were fully briefed by both parties. On August 7, 2007, the trial court lifted the stay on proceedings, ruling that "[t]he Satomi decision controls," and denied "defendants [sic] request for mandatory arbitration on the Association's claims for breach of implied and express warranties of the Washington Condominium Act."⁶

The Order Granting Motion to Lift Stay did not expressly rule on Blakeley Village's motion to stay the non-Washington Condominium Act

³ See Defendant Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in Complaint as "Blakeley Commons, LLC") Motion to Stay Trial Court Proceedings and Compel Arbitration at 1:18-24, 3:6-10, 6:18-21, 14:16-19, 16:15-18. Clerk's Papers, pp. 153 - 168.

⁴ See Order Granting Blakeley Village, LLC's Motion to Stay Trial Court Proceedings. CP, pp. 323-326.

⁵ See Defendant Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in Complaint as "Blakeley Commons, LLC") Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Lift Stay and Cross Motion to Compel Arbitration (the "Renewed Motion to Compel Arbitration") at 2:10-13, 6:13-15, 11:19-12:18. CP, pp. 348-554.

⁶ See Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay on Proceedings and Deny Mandatory Arbitration of its WCA Claims (the "Order Granting Motion to Lift Stay"). CP, pp. 739-741.

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the

the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the

the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the

the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the

the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the

the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the

the nineteenth is the fact that the
the twentieth is the fact that the
the twenty-first is the fact that the

the twenty-second is the fact that the
the twenty-third is the fact that the
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the

the twenty-fifth is the fact that the
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the

("WCA") claims, which motion was based on Satomi's holding that the HOA's non-WCA claims in that case are arbitrable. Therefore, on August 8, 2007, Blakeley Village moved for clarification of the Order Granting Motion to Lift Stay.⁷ The trial court granted Blakeley Village's motion for clarification and stayed trial court proceedings with respect to the HOA's non-WCA claims, pending arbitration of those claims.⁸

On September 4, 2007, Blakeley Village filed its Notice of Appeal to this Court for Direct Review.⁹ Direct review by this Court was accepted and, on or about April 2, 2008, this appeal was consolidated with two other appeals concerning the same or similar issues, Satomi and The Pier at Leschi Condominium Assoc., LLC v. Leschi Corp.

On July 7, 2008, the HOA improperly filed with the trial court its Motion to Set Trial Date. The Motion to Set Trial Date was opposed by Blakeley Village.¹⁰ On August 18, 2008, the trial court issued its Order Denying Motion to Set Trial Date. On August 26, 2008, the HOA moved

⁷ See Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in Complaint as "Blakeley Commons, LLC") Motion for Clarification of August 3, 2007 Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay on Proceedings and Deny Mandatory Arbitration of its WCA Claims. CP, pp. 742-747.

⁸ See Order Granting Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in Complaint as "Blakeley Commons, LLC") Motion for Clarification of August 3, 2007 Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay on Proceedings and Deny Mandatory Arbitration of its WCA Claims (the "Clarification Order"). CP, pp. 750-752.

⁹ See Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in the Caption as "Blakeley Commons LLC") Notice of Appeal to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington for Direct Review. CP, pp. 753-762.

¹⁰ A copy of Blakeley Village's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Set Trial Date is provided in the Appendix to this brief at pp. 1-43.

The first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

this Court to supplement the record on appeal with the Motion to Set Trial Date and all supporting declarations and exhibits.

Oral argument in this consolidated appeal is set for September 23, 2008.

III. STATEMENT OF GROUNDS FOR OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION

A. RAPs 9.9 and 9.10 Do Not Apply to Respondent's Request to Supplement the Record with New Evidence.

The HOA seeks to supplement the record with its Motion to Set Trial Date, which was improperly brought before the trial court only two months ago. The Motion to Set Trial Date includes supporting declarations by unit owners, attached to which are portions of the unit owners' Purchase and Sale agreements. The argument the HOA is trying to make, at this late date and for the first time, is that a few unit owners cannot remember signing the Warranty Addendum in the Purchase and Sale Agreements. The HOA disingenuously claims that the portions of the Purchase and Sale Agreements it seeks to introduce were previously undiscoverable due to the stay on trial court proceedings, despite the subject agreements being between the HOA's own members and Blakeley Village, and the access to Blakeley Village's files that was long ago provided to the HOA. RAPs 9.9 and 9.10, relied on by the HOA, do not apply in this circumstance.

RAP 9.9 allows for supplementation of a report of proceedings.
Jackson v. Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission 43

REPORT

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country. It is a very interesting and informative study of the country's history and development. The second part of the report deals with the specific details of the country's economy and social structure. It is a very detailed and thorough study of the country's resources and potential. The third part of the report deals with the country's political and legal system. It is a very comprehensive study of the country's government and laws. The fourth part of the report deals with the country's culture and education. It is a very detailed study of the country's traditions and beliefs. The fifth part of the report deals with the country's environment and natural resources. It is a very thorough study of the country's flora and fauna. The sixth part of the report deals with the country's transportation and communication systems. It is a very detailed study of the country's roads and railways. The seventh part of the report deals with the country's health and medical services. It is a very comprehensive study of the country's hospitals and clinics. The eighth part of the report deals with the country's labor and employment situation. It is a very detailed study of the country's workers and employers. The ninth part of the report deals with the country's foreign relations and international trade. It is a very thorough study of the country's trade partners and agreements. The tenth part of the report deals with the country's defense and military forces. It is a very detailed study of the country's armed forces and equipment. The eleventh part of the report deals with the country's population and demographics. It is a very comprehensive study of the country's people and their characteristics. The twelfth part of the report deals with the country's future prospects and challenges. It is a very detailed study of the country's potential and problems. The thirteenth part of the report deals with the country's conclusion and recommendations. It is a very thorough study of the country's overall situation and future prospects. The fourteenth part of the report deals with the country's appendix and references. It is a very detailed study of the country's sources and materials. The fifteenth part of the report deals with the country's index and glossary. It is a very comprehensive study of the country's terms and definitions. The sixteenth part of the report deals with the country's bibliography and list of sources. It is a very thorough study of the country's references and citations. The seventeenth part of the report deals with the country's notes and footnotes. It is a very detailed study of the country's additional information and comments. The eighteenth part of the report deals with the country's acknowledgments and thanks. It is a very comprehensive study of the country's appreciation and gratitude. The nineteenth part of the report deals with the country's disclaimer and liability. It is a very detailed study of the country's responsibility and accountability. The twentieth part of the report deals with the country's conclusion and final remarks. It is a very thorough study of the country's overall findings and conclusions.

Wn.App. 827, 831, 720 P.2d 457 (1986).¹¹ The trial court motions that led to this appeal were heard without oral argument. As indicated in Blakeley Village's Statement in Lieu of Arrangements, no narrative or verbatim report of the trial court proceedings was submitted to this Court.¹² The trial court record before this Court consists of the Clerk's Papers, containing written motions, responses, replies and trial court orders. RAP 9.9, concerning supplementation of a report of proceedings, does not apply to the HOA's request to supplement the record with its recent Motion to Set Trial Date.

RAP 9.10 allows a party to request that additional portions of an existing trial record be transmitted to the appellate court. *Buckley v. Snapper Power Equipment Co.*, 61 Wn.App. 932, 941, 813 P.2d 125 (1991); *Harbison v. Garden Valley Outfitters, Inc.*, 69 Wn.App. 590, 593, 849 P.2d 669 (1993) (RAP 9.10 "...pertains only to additions to the record of earlier trial court proceedings [that were] considered below."). The HOA's Motion to Set Trial Date does not represent "earlier trial court proceedings," nor was the motion "considered below." The Motion to Set

¹¹ RAP 9.9 reads as follows:

The report of proceedings may be corrected or supplemented by the trial court on motion of a party, or on stipulation of the parties, at any time prior to the transmission of the report to the appellate court. The trial court may impose the same kinds of sanctions provided in rule 18.9(a) as a condition to correcting or supplementing the report of proceedings after the time provided in rule 9.5.

¹² See Blakeley Village's Statement in Lieu of Arrangements, a copy of which is provided in the Appendix to this brief at pp. 44-45.

[illegible]

Trial Date was improperly brought before the trial court, which currently lacks jurisdiction in these matters, *over a year after the trial court proceedings at issue in this appeal had concluded*. Moreover, the materials included in the HOA's untimely Motion to Set Trial Date obviously were not considered by the trial court in issuing the order on review, for the trial court properly held that it lacked jurisdiction in light of the appeal pending for a year. RAP 9.10 clearly does not apply.

The HOA's Motion to Supplement the Record is a belated attempt to introduce evidence and make new arguments that it inexcusably failed to bring before the trial court at the appropriate time.

B. Respondent's Request to Introduce New Evidence Does Not Meet the Narrow Criteria Enumerated in RAP 9.11.

As noted above, the HOA is attempting to supplement the record with its Motion to Set Trial Date, and supporting declarations, attached to which are portions of four Purchase and Sale Agreements relating to units at the project. The Motion to Set Trial Date was improperly brought before the trial court only two months ago.

Although the HOA has not invoked RAP 9.11, that provision also does not permit the too late and improper supplementation now sought by the HOA. RAP 9.11 is a limited remedy under which this Court may allow the record to be supplemented with new evidence if *all* of the following six criteria are met: (1) additional proof of facts is needed to fairly resolve the issues on review; (2) the additional evidence would probably change the decision being reviewed; (3) it is equitable to excuse a party's failure to

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator, who is usually a member of the research team. The investigator will identify the problem by looking at the data and trying to find out what is going on.

2. The second step is to formulate a hypothesis. This is a statement that the investigator believes is true. It is usually based on the data that the investigator has seen.

3. The third step is to design an experiment. This is a plan that the investigator will use to test the hypothesis. It usually involves a series of steps that the investigator will follow.

4. The fourth step is to conduct the experiment. This is where the investigator actually does the experiment. They will follow the steps that they designed in the previous step.

5. The fifth step is to analyze the data. This is where the investigator looks at the results of the experiment and tries to figure out what they mean.

6. The sixth step is to draw a conclusion. This is where the investigator decides whether or not the hypothesis was supported by the data.

7. The seventh step is to write a report. This is where the investigator writes up what they did and what they found.

8. The eighth step is to present the results. This is where the investigator shows their results to other people.

9. The ninth step is to discuss the results. This is where the investigator talks about what they think the results mean.

10. The tenth step is to publish the results. This is where the investigator puts their results in a journal or other place where other people can see them.

1. *Handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to fading and the quality of the scan. It appears to be a list or a series of notes, possibly related to a medical or scientific study.*

present the evidence to the trial court; (4) the remedy available to a party through postjudgment motions in the trial court is inadequate or unnecessarily expensive; (5) the appellate court remedy of granting a new trial is inadequate or unnecessarily expensive; and (6) it would be inequitable to decide the case solely on the evidence already taken in the trial court. *Hurbison*, 69 Wn.App. at 593-94; *see also Lamon v. Butler*, 112 Wn.2d 193, 199, 770 P.2d 1027 (1989) (“...we deny the LaMons’ motion to supplement the record with this evidence pursuant to RAP 9.11, there being no excuse for their failure to present the evidence to the trial court below.”).

The HOA’s request does not satisfy several of RAP 9.11’s mandatory criteria.

The HOA’s request does not meet the first necessary factor, additional proof of facts being needed to fairly resolve the issues on review. *The issue of whether each original unit purchaser signed a Warranty Addendum is not on review.* Attached to the Declaration of Lis Soldano in Support of Blakeley Village, LLC’s (Incorrectly Identified in the Caption as “Blakeley Commons LLC”) Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay Proceedings are signature pages on the Warranty Addendum relating to the original purchase of 103 of the 106 residential units at the project.¹³

¹³ *See* Declaration of Lis Soldano in Support of Blakeley Village, LLC’s Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay Proceedings, CP, pp. 13-130. In its Motion to Set Trial Date, the HOA claims that four people do not recall signing Warranty Addendums. Two of the four of these people purchased *commercial* units. Only the residential units at the project are at issue in the lawsuit. Blakeley Village requests further opportunity to brief this issue, if necessary.

[illegible]

The following information is provided for the purpose of providing a general overview of the information contained in the following documents. The information is not intended to be a substitute for the actual documents and should not be used for legal purposes.

Ms. Soldano's declaration states that it was Blakeley Village's standard practice to require a signed Warranty Addendum in relation to each sale and the remaining three signature pages have apparently been misplaced. The HOA, in response to Blakeley Village's initial motion to compel arbitration and in response to Blakeley Village's renewed motion to compel arbitration, filed approximately one-year later, did not attempt to rebut Ms. Soldano's declaration. Accordingly, the trial court, in ordering arbitration, held on the record before it that arbitration was required "based on (1) the arbitration provisions in the Warranty Addendums to the Purchase and Sale Agreements entered into by the Blakeley Commons owners..."¹⁴ In short, the trial court held that each owner signed a Warranty Addendum.

RAP 5.1(d) requires that a party seeking cross review must file a notice of appeal or a notice for discretionary review within the time allowed by rule 5.2(f). The HOA has not filed a notice of appeal or notice of discretionary review and has thus not complied with RAPs 5.1(d) and 5.2(f). A party seeking cross review must also include in its brief a separate concise statement of each error it contends was made by the trial court, together with the issues pertaining to the assignments of error. RAP 10.3(a)(4); *see also Fluor Enters., Inc. v. Walter Constr., Ltd.*, 141

¹⁴ *See* Order Granting Blakeley Village, LLC's (Incorrectly Identified in Complaint as "Blakeley Commons, LLC") Motion for Clarification of August 3, 2007 Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay on Proceedings and Deny Mandatory Arbitration of its WCA Claims (the "Clarification Order"). CP, pp. 750-752.

The first of these is the fact that the
 government has been unable to raise the
 necessary funds to meet its obligations.
 This is due to a combination of factors,
 including a decline in tax revenue and
 an increase in government spending.
 The second factor is the fact that the
 government has been unable to attract
 foreign investment. This is due to a
 number of reasons, including a lack of
 political stability and a weak legal
 system. The third factor is the fact that
 the government has been unable to
 implement effective economic reforms.
 This is due to a number of reasons,
 including a lack of political will and
 a weak legal system. The fourth factor
 is the fact that the government has been
 unable to attract foreign investment.
 This is due to a number of reasons,
 including a lack of political stability and
 a weak legal system. The fifth factor
 is the fact that the government has been
 unable to implement effective economic
 reforms. This is due to a number of
 reasons, including a lack of political will
 and a weak legal system. The sixth
 factor is the fact that the government has
 been unable to attract foreign investment.
 This is due to a number of reasons,
 including a lack of political stability and
 a weak legal system. The seventh factor
 is the fact that the government has been
 unable to implement effective economic
 reforms. This is due to a number of
 reasons, including a lack of political will
 and a weak legal system. The eighth
 factor is the fact that the government has
 been unable to attract foreign investment.
 This is due to a number of reasons,
 including a lack of political stability and
 a weak legal system. The ninth factor
 is the fact that the government has been
 unable to implement effective economic
 reforms. This is due to a number of
 reasons, including a lack of political will
 and a weak legal system. The tenth
 factor is the fact that the government has
 been unable to attract foreign investment.
 This is due to a number of reasons,
 including a lack of political stability and
 a weak legal system.

It is important to remember that the concept of "personality" is not a static one. It is a dynamic process that changes over time and across situations. The concept of "personality" is also a social construct, meaning that it is shaped by the culture and society in which it is used. The concept of "personality" is also a complex one, as it involves many different factors, including biology, psychology, and social environment. The concept of "personality" is also a controversial one, as there are many different theories and models of personality. The concept of "personality" is also a useful one, as it helps us to understand ourselves and others better. The concept of "personality" is also a challenging one, as it is difficult to measure and study. The concept of "personality" is also a fascinating one, as it is a central part of human experience. The concept of "personality" is also a complex one, as it involves many different factors, including biology, psychology, and social environment. The concept of "personality" is also a controversial one, as there are many different theories and models of personality. The concept of "personality" is also a useful one, as it helps us to understand ourselves and others better. The concept of "personality" is also a challenging one, as it is difficult to measure and study. The concept of "personality" is also a fascinating one, as it is a central part of human experience.

Wn.App. 761, 771, 172 P.3d 368 (2007) ("But Fluor did not file a cross-appeal or assign error to the trial court's consolidation order as required by RAP 5.1(d) and RAP 10.3(a)(4). Thus, this issue is not properly before us."). The HOA's Counterstatement of Issues in its Brief of Respondent does not assign error to the trial court's finding that each original unit owner signed a Warranty Addendum.¹⁵ The HOA notes, in passing and without challenging Ms. Soldano's testimony that each owner signed a Warranty Addendum, that Blakeley Village acknowledges that three of the signed Warranty Addendums can no longer be located.¹⁶ The HOA's three-sentence observation, made in passing in the body of its appeal brief, without assigning error to the trial court's decision on the issue and without filing any notice of cross appeal, is not sufficient to bring the issue within the scope of review before this Court. The first necessary factor under RAP 9.11 is plainly not met.

Thus, the evidence with which the HOA seeks to supplement the record does not speak to any issue on review. In its motion, the HOA makes no argument to the contrary. As the evidence the HOA seeks to introduce does not speak to any issue on review, there is no probability

¹⁵ The HOA's Counterstatement of Issues reads, in its entirety, as follows:

- A. Does the FAA preclude judicial remedies for Washington Condominium Act claims?
- B. Do arbitration agreements entered into by original condominium purchasers bind a condominium association that is not a party to the agreements?
- C. Is a unilateral arbitration provision unconscionable?

Brief of Respondent, p. 3.

¹⁶ Brief of Respondent, p. 11

that the evidence will change any decision concerning an issue on review, and so the second necessary factor under RAP 9.11 is also not met.

The third necessary factor under RAP 9.11 is whether it is equitable to excuse the HOA's failure to present the "new" evidence to the trial court at the appropriate time. This factor is also not met. The portions of the Purchase and Sale Agreements attached as exhibits to the unit owner declarations in support of the HOA's Motion to Set Trial Date come from Blakeley Village's files, without any explanation for why the HOA did not simply use the copies in the possession of its own members! Further, despite the stay on formal discovery in the trial court proceedings, Blakeley Village was amenable to providing the HOA access to Blakeley Village's files from the time of completion of a privilege review prior to November 10, 2006.¹⁷ To arrange for a review of Blakeley Village's files, all the HOA had to do was ask. The HOA waited until October 10, 2007 to begin its review of Blakeley Village's files.¹⁸ Had it diligently pursued a review of Blakeley Village's files, the HOA would have obtained the "new" evidence up to eight months prior to Blakeley Village's Renewed Motion to Compel Arbitration (putting aside, again, the fact that the HOA could simply have obtained the documents from its own members) and it could have presented the evidence to the trial court at that time. It is not

¹⁷ Declaration of Daniel L. Dvorkin in Support of Appellant Blakeley Village, LLC's Opposition to Respondent's Motion to Supplement Record.

¹⁸ *Id.*

The first of these is the fact that the
 government has been unable to
 maintain a consistent policy
 towards the press. In the
 past, it has been known for
 the government to
 suppress the press, but in
 recent years it has
 been known to
 support the press.
 This has led to
 a situation where
 the press is
 unable to
 report on the
 government's
 activities.
 This is a
 serious
 problem,
 and it is
 one that
 must be
 solved.

[illegible]

equitable to allow the HOA to supplement the record with this "new" evidence at this extremely late date. The third necessary factor is not met.

It would not be unfair to decide the case solely on the evidence already taken in the trial court. The sixth necessary factor is not met. In its original Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay Proceedings, Blakeley Village submitted to the trial court executed Warranty Addendum signature pages for 103 of the 106 units at the project. The declaration of Lis Soldano, to which the signatures pages were attached, states that it was Blakeley Village's standard practice to require a signed Warranty Addendum for the completion of each sale and that the 3 missing signature pages had been misplaced. Despite having continued access to Blakeley Village's files since approximately November 10, 2006 and having finally begun its document review on October 10, 2007, the HOA made not one argument regarding missing signatures on the Warranty Addenda until it filed its belated, improper Motion to Set Trial Date. With only fourteen days remaining before oral argument in this appeal, the HOA seeks to introduce additional evidence concerning signatures on the Warranty Addendum. Under these circumstances, it is appropriate and fair to decide the case solely on the evidence previously taken in the trial court.

Blakeley Village respectfully requests that the Court deny the HOA's motion to supplement the record.

C. If the Court is Inclined to Allow the "New" Evidence, Blakeley Village Should be Afforded the Opportunity to File a Supplemental Brief Regarding the Same.

As a matter of fairness, if the Court is inclined to allow the record to be supplemented as requested by the HOA, Blakeley Village requests the opportunity to file a supplemental brief with this Court regarding the "new" evidence.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this ⁴9th day of September, 2008



JOEL T. SALMI, WSBA #6808

DANIEL L. DVORKIN, WSBA #32776

STELLMAN KEEHNEL, WSBA #9309

KIT ROTH, WSBA #33059

DLA PIPER US LLP

Attorneys for Defendant-Petitioner

Blakeley Village, LLC

1. The first part of the report is a general
introduction to the subject of the study.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed
description of the methods used in the study.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion
of the results of the study.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion
of the study.

5. The fifth part of the report is a list of
references.

6. The sixth part of the report is a list of
figures.

7. The seventh part of the report is a list of
tables.

8. The eighth part of the report is a list of
appendices.

9. The ninth part of the report is a list of
acknowledgments.

10. The tenth part of the report is a list of
the author's address.